



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/471,890	06/07/1995	DONALD R. HUFFMAN	MITS-003/05US 308622-2007	9010
58249	7590	10/20/2011	EXAMINER	
COOLEY LLP ATTN: Patent Group Suite 1100 777 - 6th Street, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001			YUAN, DAH WEI D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1717	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/20/2011	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Response to Rule 312 Communication</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	08/471,890	HUFFMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	DAH-WEI YUAN	1717

***-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 26 September 2011 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

The 312 amendment filed on 9/26/11 is disapproved. Proposed amended claim 127 reads on the sooty carbon product (which can be interpreted as a formed product) of Kappler et al. and Lefeverre et al, since the C60 and C70 inherently present in the sooty carbon product are not purified. Contrary to applicant's remarks filed on 9/26/2011, the examiner has not previously agreed to such amendment to claim 127. Regardless of whether there was actually any agreement, the claims examined and found allowable were those filed on 7/22/2011.

/Dah-Wei D. Yuan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1717